

6653

G-000-601 .22

**OHIO'S AIP PERFORMANCE REPORT FOR PERIOD OCTOBER -
DECEMBER 1994**

02/28/95

OEPA
6
LETTER

DOE-HQ



State of Ohio Environmental Protection Agency

Southwest District Office

401 East Fifth Street
Dayton, Ohio 45402-2911
(513) 285-6357
FAX (513) 285-6249

6653

RECEIVED
I-1636
MAR 2 10 45 AM '95

George V. Voinovich
Governor

February 28, 1995

Ms. Cameo Smoot
DOE Headquarters
L'Enfant Plaza
Comsat Building, 7th Floor
Washington, D.C. 20585

Dear Ms. Smoot:

Attached please find a copy of Ohio's AIP Performance Report for the period October - December, 1994. The Financial Status Report has been sent under separate cover. Ohio continues to make significant progress in implementing the AIP. Please contact me if you have any questions or suggestions about the content or format of this report.

Sincerely,

Graham E. Mitchell
Chief, Office of Federal
Facilities Oversight

GEM/bjb

Enclosure

cc: Jenny Tiell, Director's Office, w/o attachments
Tom Winston, SWDO, w/o attachments
Jan Carlson, DERR, w/o attachments
Pat Campbell, DERR/OFFO, with attachments
Robert Owen, ODH, with attachments
Lewis Meyers, Jr., OEMA, with attachments
Tom Schneider, OFFO, w/o attachments
Brian Nickel, OFFO, w/o attachments
John Rochotte, DERR, SEDO, w/o attachments
Mark Million, DOE Oak Ridge, with attachments
Sue Smiley, DOE, OFFO, with attachments
Jack Craig, DOE Fernald, with attachments
Mike Reker, DOE Mound, with attachments
John Sheppard, DOE Portsmouth, with attachments



STATE OF OHIO

AIP PERFORMANCE REPORT

OCTOBER - DECEMBER, 1994

**STATE OF OHIO AIP PERFORMANCE REPORT
OCTOBER - DECEMBER 1994**

Summary

1. During this reporting period, Ohio continued to establish the AIP program. Most hiring of Ohio EPA (OEPA) staff has been completed and Ohio Department of Health (ODH) and Ohio Emergency Management Agency (OEMA) still have pending vacancies. Evaluation of DOE site specific environmental monitoring programs are underway at Fernald, Mound, and Portsmouth. Actual environmental monitoring in the form of split samples is underway at Fernald and Mound sites.

2. The Financial Status Report has been sent under separate cover. In discussions with the Ohio Field Office we are working to extend our first year AIP funds until June 30, 1995. This will allow our program to be on the same fiscal year as the state which apparently will work more effectively for DOE as well. We have also been informed that our AIP will be split into two grants - one for Fernald and Mound managed out of the Ohio Field Office and another for Portsmouth managed out of Oak Ridge.

Administration

1. Regular AIP implementation and coordination meetings continue to occur at the dates and locations listed below with OEPA, ODH, OEMA, DOE sites, and Ohio Field Office representation.

October 19, 1994 - at OEMA (Columbus)

2. The Memorandum of Understanding between OEPA, ODH, and OEMA was signed by all Directors and Department Heads by October 31, 1994.

3. Security Clearances - All selected staff from OEPA and OEMA have received necessary Q or L clearances. Some additional clearances may be needed for ODH staff. As noted in past reports, that in an effort to save money, only key staff members from each agency and site have been selected to apply for clearances.

Environmental Monitoring

Scope of Work/Objectives

1. Evaluate and oversee DOE environmental monitoring programs at Fernald, Mound and Portsmouth sites. Provide comments to DOE.
2. Establish and conduct an Ohio Environmental Monitoring Program at these sites that include split sampling and independent sampling of environmental media.
3. Involve the public in this process and communicate results to the public and other stakeholders.

Accomplishments

1. Monthly split sampling activities continue at the DOE-Fernald site.
2. Monthly split sampling activities at Mound started in November 1994 and continued at the DOE Mound site.

State of Ohio AIP Performance Report
October - December 1994
Page 2

3. Ohio continued the process of evaluating the existing environmental monitoring programs at Fernald, Mound and Portsmouth.

A. The Fernald evaluation was the first to start. Numerous meetings have been held with DOE staff to discuss issues and receive additional documentation. This process will continue and include input from the public and should produce a report to DOE and the public in March 1995.

B. The process of evaluation has started at the Mound site with a meeting on October 20, 1994, and will focus first on surface water and sediment.

C. The process of evaluation has also started at Portsmouth.

Environmental Data Management

1. Training began in October for Ohio EPA staff associated with the purchase of Intergraph Geographic Information System work stations. Staff traveled to both Detroit, Michigan and Huntsville, Alabama for training. In December the work stations arrived and the process of set up and onsite training began. Making these systems operational early in Ohio's AIP program should enable the state to better evaluate the huge volumes of data available. These systems will first be mainly used for work at Fernald and then be expanded to cover Mound and Portsmouth.

Review of DOE Programmatic Issues

Scope of Work/Objectives

1. Review DOE programmatic issues and documents that impact Ohio sites. Issues included in this review are DOE budgets, PEIS, documentation, national waste management plans, reconfiguration plans, etc.

Accomplishments

1. The staff person hired for this position has used this past quarter to familiarize himself with programmatic issues impacting DOE. He has been very active in budget meetings and issues related to the "train wreck" and budget shortfalls associated with the administration's proposed budget.

2. We have also participated in CERE meetings and activities related to risk.

EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT

Scope of Work/Objectives

To ensure that past and present activities at the Fernald Environmental Management Project (FEMP), the Portsmouth Gaseous Diffusion Plant (PORTS), and the Mound Laboratories (MOUND) pose

minimal risk to the citizens and environment of Ohio. This will be accomplished by:

1. Revising and maintaining the State Hazmat Plan with USDOE facilities Annex;
2. Conducting joint training with USDOE and county responders;
3. Conducting periodic drills and exercises with USDOE and county responders;
4. Monitoring and improving the communications and warning systems between the State, counties, and USDOE facilities;
5. Improving Ohio's Emergency Operations Center to better deal with and mitigate events at USDOE facilities; and
6. Conduct joint public information operations with the USDOE facilities.

Accomplishments

1. Ohio EMA conducted an Introduction to CAMEO course at PORTS for members of MMUS, MMES, and USDOE.
2. Received completed Hazards Analysis/Risk Management Questionnaires from FEMP and PORTS. The questionnaires facilitated the completion of screening hazards analysis for those facilities. Questionnaires were also used to begin the compilation of emergency management databases for each facility.
3. Ohio EMA received one Q clearance and two L clearances for personnel that have significant responsibilities concerning planning, response, and recovery operations for areas surrounding USDOE facilities.
4. Attended four exercise design meetings for the PORTS Emergency Teamwork 94 exercise.
5. Completed and distributed Revision 5 to the State Hazmat Plan and USDOE Annex. Update included new procedures for state responders to follow when involved with an onsite event that has the potential to escalate and affect offsite populations.

Significant Changes from Intended Activities

None

State of Ohio AIP Performance Report
October - December 1994
Page 4

Significant Issues

1. Ohio EMA still desires to understand the relationship between USDOE, USEC, and the NRC at PORTS. Which agency has oversight responsibility of operations and emergency preparedness; what laws, orders, and guidelines (for emergency preparedness) apply to the site? What is the role of USEC and the NRC in the AIP? Is PORTS a private facility that is subject to the same requirements of any other private facility.
2. Ohio EMA continues to evaluate the benefits of acquiring computers for planning, training, assessment, and response in relation to USDOE facilities.
3. Ohio EMA has yet to receive the Hazards Analysis/Risk Management Questionnaire from the MOUND facility. Consequently, a hazards analysis and emergency management databases for the MOUND have not been started.